UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,526	01/06/2004	Naoto Kigasawa	NAG-0117	3293
23353 7590 06/11/2007 RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING			EXAMINER	
			SCHLIENTZ, NATHAN W	
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/11/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<u>'</u>	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	10/751,526	KIGASAWA, NAOTO				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Nathan W. Schlientz	1616				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	n the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tute, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06</u>	January 2004.					
· /—	·					
•—	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the application	on.					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	•				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	ection is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume		119(a)-(d) or (f).				
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		oplication No				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p		·				
application from the International Bure	eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a l	ist of the certified copies not	received.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08))/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	<u>_</u> ·				

Application/Control Number: 10/751,526

Art Unit: 1616

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-12, drawn to a feed for silkworm, classified in class 424, 1. subclass 442; and class 426, subclass 635.
- Claims 13 and 14, drawn to silk produced by silkworms, classified in class II. 530, subclass 353.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

1. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have materially different designs. Invention I is drawn to a silkworm feed comprising functional particles, whereas Invention II is drawn to the silk produced by a silkworm and a silk product thereof. Therefore, the silk product and the functional particle feed are not related.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Telephonic Inquiry

A telephone call was made to Yoichiro Yamaguchi, Esq. on 6 June 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan W. Schlientz whose telephone number is 571-

Application/Control Number: 10/751,526 Page 4

Art Unit: 1616

272-9924. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM, Monday

through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nathan W. Schlientz Patent Examiner Technology Center 1600 Group Art Unit 1616

Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600

Group Art Unit 1616